Kevin Walker, sui juris, In Propria Persona (PRO PER: NOT PRO SE)

C/o 30650 Rancho California Road #406-251

Temecula, California [92591]

2

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

26

27

28

non-domestic without the United States

Email: team@walkernovagroup.com

Attorney-In-Fact, Executor, and Authorized Representative,

for Real Party(ies) in Interest/Plaintiff(s)

TMKEVIN WALKER© ESTATE, TMKEVIN LEWIS WALKER©,

TMKEVIN WALKER© IRR TRUST

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TMKEVIN WALKER© ESTATE, et al.,
Plaintiff(s)/Real Party(ies) in Interest,

US.

Chad Bianco, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No.: 55:25-cv-00646-WLH

PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF ABSOLUTE DECLINE OF MAGISTRATE JURISDICTION AND DEMAND FOR FULL ADJUDICATION BY AN ARTICLE III JUDGE

FILED CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

MAR 2 5 2025

CENTRAL DISTRICL F

PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF ABSOLUTE DECLINE OF MAGISTRATE JURISDICTION

AND DEMAND FOR FULL ADJUDICATION BY AN ARTICLE III JUDGE

COMES NOW, Plaintiffs TMKEVIN WALKER© ESTATE, TMKEVIN LEWIS

WALKER©, TMKEVIN WALKER© IRR TRUST (hereinafter "Plaintiffs" and/or

"Real Party(ies) in Interest"), by and through their Attorney-in-Fact, Kevin: Walker,

23 who is proceeding *sui juris*, *In Propria Persona*, and by *Special Limited*

Appearance (NOT generally). Kevin is natural freeborn sovereign, one of the

25 people, and state Citizen of California the republic in its De'jure capacity as one of

the several states of the Union 1789. This incidentally makes him a non-citizen

national/national American of the republic as per the De'Jure Constitution for the

United States 1777/1789.

Plaintiffs, acting through their Attorney-in-Fact, assert their inherent *unalienable* right to <u>contract</u>, as secured by Article I, Section 10 of the Constitution, which states: "No State shall... pass any Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts," and thus which *prohibits* states from impairing the obligation of contracts.

This clause unequivocally prohibits states from impairing the obligation of contracts, including but not limited to, a trust and contract agreement as an 'Attorney-In-Fact,' and any private contract existing between Plaintiffs and Defendants. A copy of the 'Affidavit: Power of Attorney In Fact,' is attached hereto

Plaintiffs further rely on their inherent rights under the **Constitution** and the **common law**—rights that **predate** the formation of the tatse and remain safeguarded by **due process of law**.

I. <u>Constitutional Basis:</u>

as **Exhibits** A and incorporated herein by reference.

Plaintiffs assert that their private rights are secured and protected under the **Constitution**, **common law**, and **exclusive equity**, which govern their ability to freely contract and protect their property and interests..

Plaintiffs respectfully assert and affirm:

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

"The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights as a citizen. He is entitled to carry on his private business in his own way. His power to contract is *unlimited*. He owes no such duty [to submit his books and papers for an examination] to the State, since he receives nothing therefrom, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land [Common Law] long antecedent to the organization of the State, and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. Among his rights are a refusal to incriminate himself, and the immunity of himself and his property from arrest or seizure except under a warrant of the law. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights." (*Hale v. Henkel*, 201 U.S. 43, 47 [1905]).

"The claim and exercise of a constitutional right cannot be converted into a crime."—Miller v. U.S., 230 F 2d 486, 489.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- "Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule
 making or legislation which would abrogate them." Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S.
- "There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of this exercise of constitutional rights." —Sherar v. Cullen, 481 F. 945.
- "A law repugnant to the Constitution is void." *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137, 177 (1803).
- "It is not the duty of the citizen to surrender his rights, liberties, and immunities under the guise of police power or any other governmental power." *Miranda v*. *Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436, 491 (1966).
- "An unconstitutional act is not law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; affords no protection; it creates no office; it is, in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed." *Norton v. Shelby County*, 118 U.S. 425, 442 (1886).
- "No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law, and no courts are bound to enforce it." 16 Am. Jur. 2d, Sec. 177, Late Am. Jur. 2d, Sec. 256.
- "Sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts." Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356, 370 (1886).

II. <u>Supremacy Clause</u>

Plaintiffs respectfully assert and affirm that:

• The Supremacy Clause of the Constitution of the <u>United States</u> (Article VI, Clause 2) establishes that the Constitution, federal laws made pursuant to it, and treaties made under its authority, constitute the "supreme Law of the Land", and thus take priority over any conflicting state laws. It provides that state courts are bound by, and state constitutions subordinate to, the supreme law. However, federal statutes and treaties must be within the parameters of the Constitution;

that is, they must be pursuant to the federal government's enumerated powers, and not violate other constitutional limits on federal power ... As a constitutional provision identifying the supremacy of federal law, the Supremacy Clause assumes the underlying priority of federal authority, albeit only when that authority is expressed in the Constitution itself; no matter what the federal or state governments might wish to do, they must stay within the boundaries of the Constitution.

III. PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF ABSOLUTE DECLINATION OF MAGISTRATE JURISDICTION AND DEMAND FOR FULL ADJUDICATION BY AN ARTICLE III JUDGE

Plaintiffs hereby formally and unequivocally decline consent to the referral of any proceedings, including but not limited to pretrial matters, hearings, rulings, or final adjudications, to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) or any other applicable statute or rule.

As Plaintiffs and injured parties before this Court, Plaintiffs invoke their constitutional right to have this case heard, presided over, and adjudicated solely by a duly appointed United States District Judge who holds office under Article III of the United States Constitution. This demand is made in strict adherence to constitutional principles that ensure judicial integrity, independence, and the protections afforded to Article III judges, including lifetime tenure and salary protection.

A. Reasons for Declining Consent

- Judicial Independence Article III judges enjoy lifetime tenure and salary
 protections to safeguard against undue influence, ensuring impartiality and
 judicial integrity as mandated by Article III, Section 1 of the United States
 Constitution.
- 2. Due Process and Fundamental Rights The appointment, tenure, and constitutional protections afforded to Article III judges are essential in

- preserving the integrity of the judicial process and protecting Plaintiffs' fundamental right to an impartial tribunal.
- **3. Constitutional Adherence** Plaintiffs seek adjudication by an Article III judge to uphold the constitutional separation of powers and maintain adherence to the mandates governing the federal judiciary.

B. Demand for Exclusive Article III Jurisdiction

Accordingly, Plaintiffs formally demand that this matter be assigned exclusively to an **Article III District Judge** for *all* proceedings, including but not limited to

pretrial matters, hearings, rulings, and final disposition of this case. No US

Magistrate judge shall preside over any aspect of this litigation.

C. Formal Notice of Non-Consent to Magistrate Jurisdiction

This Notice serves as Plaintiffs' **formal and absolute declination of consent** to magistrate jurisdiction. Plaintiffs do not and will not consent to any magistrate judge's involvement in any phase of these proceedings. Plaintiffs respectfully demand immediate reassignment to an **Article III judge** *exclusively* in accordance with their **constitutional rights** and applicable law.

17 **//**18 **//**

13

15

1

2

3

5

19 /

20

21

22

23

25

26

27

28

COMMERCIAL OATH AND VERIFICATION:

County of Riverside)

) Commercial Oath and Verification

24 The State of California

I, <u>KEVIN WALKER</u>, under my unlimited liability and Commercial Oath proceeding in good faith being of sound mind states that the facts contained herein are true, correct, complete and not misleading to the best of Affiant's knowledge and belief under penalty of International Commercial Law and state this to be HIS Affidavit of

Case	#:396 Page 6 of 11 Page ID #:396
	Express Mail #ER126149280US — Dated: March 20, 2025
1	Truth regarding same signed and sealed this <u>20TH</u> day of <u>MARCH</u> in the year of
2	Our Lord two thousand and twenty five:
3	proceeding sui juris, In Propria Persona, by Special Limited Appearance,
4	All rights reserved without prejudice or recourse, UCC § 1-308, 3-402.
5	By: This Expeller
6	Kevin-Walker, Authorized Representative, Attorney-In-Fact, Secured Party, Executor, national, private bank(er)
7	morney-in-tuci, Secureu turiy, Executor, Hadonai, prioute ounk(er)
8	//
9	Let this document stand as truth before the Almighty Supreme Creator and let it be
10	established before men according as the scriptures saith: "But if they will not listen,
11	take one or two others along, so that every matter may be established by the testimony of two
12	or three witnesses." Matthew 18:16. "In the mouth of two or three witnesses, shall every
13	word be established" 2 Corinthians 13:1.
14	Sui juris, By Special Limited Appearance,
15	By: Alt Malet Als Steven MacArthur-Brooks (WITNESS)
16	
17	Sui juris, By Special Limited Appearance,
18	By: Cay Dapa Wash. Corey Walker (WITNESS)
19	Corey Warker (WITNESS)
20	# DROOF OF CERVICE
21	PROOF OF SERVICE
22	STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
23	COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE)
24	I competent, over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within
25 26	action. My mailing address is the Delfond Group, care of: 30650 Rancho California
27	Road suite 406-251, Temecula, California [92591]. On or before March 21, 2025, I
28	served the within documents:
<i>ن</i>	-6 of 9-
	PLAINTIFES NOTICE OF ABSOLUTE DECLINE OF MAGISTRATE JURISDICTION AND HAVE FOR FULL ADJUDICATION BY AN ARTICLE HEJUDGE

Case 5:25-cv-00646-WLH-MAA Document 9 Filed 03/25/25 Page 7 of 11 Page ID

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Express Mail #ER126149280US — Dated: March 20, 2025

1	1. PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF ABSOLUTE DECLINE OF MAGISTRATE
2	JURISDICTION AND DEMAND FOR FULL ADJUDICATION BY AN ARTICL
3	III JUDGE.
4	By United States Mail. I enclosed the documents in a sealed envelope or package
5	addressed to the persons at the addresses listed below by placing the envelope for
6	collection and mailing, following our ordinary business practices. I am readily
7	familiar with this business's practice for collecting and processing correspondence
8	for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and
9	mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States
10	Postal Service, in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepared. I am a resident or
11	employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was
12	placed in the mail in Riverside County, California, and sent via Registered Mail
13	with a form 3811.
14	Clerk(s), Magistrate Judge CRD Supervisor C/o OPT OUT CONSENT-CLERK OF COURT
15	255 W. Temple Street
16	Los Angeleŝ, CA [90012] Express Mail #ER126149280US
17	Wesley L Hsu
18	C/o CLERK OF COURT 350 West 1st Street, Courtroom 9B, 9th Floor Los Appelos California [20012]
19	Los Angeles, California [90012] Registered Mail #RF775824098US
20	Gregory D Eastwood, Robert C V Bowman, George Reyes, William

C/o MENIFEE JUSTICE CENTER

30755-D Auld Road

Murrieta, California [92563] Registered Mail #RF775824107US

Steven-Arthur: Sherman C/o STEVEN ARTHUR SHERMAN 1631 East 18th Street Santa Ana, California [92705-7101] Registered Mail #RF775824115US

Chad: Bianco C/o RIVERSIDE COUNTY SHERIFF 4095 Lemon Street, 2nd Floor Riverside, California [92501]

-7 of 9-

Case 5:25-cv-00646-WLH-MAA Document 9 Filed 03/25/25 Page 8 of 11 Page ID Express Mail #ER126149280US — Dated: March 20, 2025 Registered Mail #RF775824124US By Electronic Service. Based on a contract, and/or court order, and/or an 2 agreement of the parties to accept service by electronic transmission, I caused the 3 documents to be sent to the persons at the electronic notification addresses listed below. 5 Clerk(s), Agent(s), Fiduciary(ies)
C/o CLERK OF COURT 6 255 W. Temple Street Los Angeles, CA [90012] optout consent@cacd.uscourts.gov 8 Wesley L Hsu 9 C/o ČLERK OF COURT 350 West 1st Street, Courtroom 9B, 9th Floor 10 Los Angeles, California [90012] optout consent@cacd.uscourts.gov 11 Gregory D Eastwood, Robert C V Bowman, George Reyes, William 12 Praft, Robert Gell, Joseph Sinz, Nicholas O Gruwell, C/o MENIFEE JUSTICE CENTER 30755-D Auld Road 13 Murrieta, California [92563] 14 ssherman@law4cops.com jsinz@riversidesheriff.org 15 wpratt@riversidesheriff.org 16 Steven-Arthur: Sherman C/o STEVEN ARTHUR SHERMAN 17 1631 East 18th Street Santa Ana, California [92705-7101] 18 ssherman@law4cops.com csherman@law4cops.com 19 Chad: Bianco 20 C/o RIVERSIDE COUNTY SHERIFF 4095 Lemon Street, 2nd Floor 21 Riverside, California [92501] ssherman@law4cops.com 22 csherman@law4cops.com 23 24 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct. Executed on March 20, 2025 in Riverside County, 25 26 California. /s/Donnabelle Mortel/ 27 Donnabelle Mortel 28 -8 of 9Case 5:25-cv-00646-WLH-MAA Document 9 Filed 03/25/25 Page 9 of 11 Page ID Express Mail #ER126149280US — Dated: March 20, 2025 **NOTICE:** 1 Using a notary on this document does *not* constitute any adhesion, *nor does it alter* my status in any manner. The purpose for notary is verification and identification only and not for entrance into any foreign jurisdiction. 5 6 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:** 7 State of California A notary public or other officer completing this certificate verifies only the identity of the individual who signed the document to which this certificate is attached, and not the 9) ss. truthfulness, accuracy, or validity of that document County of Riverside On this <u>20th</u> day of <u>March</u>, <u>2025</u>, before me, <u>Joyti Patel</u>, a Notary Public, 11 personally appeared Kevin Walker, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory 12 evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within 13 instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/ her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, 17 executed the instrument. I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California 18 that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct. 19 WITNESS my hand and official seal. 20 21 JOYTI PATEL otary Public - California Riverside County 22 Commission # 2407742 Signature Jayrifatel My Comm. Expires Jul 8, 2026 23 24 25 26 27 28 -9 of 9-PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF ABSOLUTE DECLINE OF MAGISTRATE JURISDICTION AND DEMAND FOR FULL ADJUDICATION BY AN ARTICLE III JUDGE









FLAT RATE ENVELOPE ONE RATE ANY WEIGHT

To schedule free Package Pickup,



TRACKED = INSURED



EP14F October 2023 OD: 12 1/2 x 9 1/2

VISIT US AT USPS.COM® ORDER FREE SUPPLIES ONLINE

For Domestic shipments, the maximum weight is 70 lbs. For international shipments, the maximum weight is 20 lbs.